

## POLLUTION PREVENTION AND WATER QUALITY WORKGROUP

Richard Looker, Facilitator	SFBRWQCB	<a href="mailto:Rlooker@waterboards.ca.gov">Rlooker@waterboards.ca.gov</a>
Jennifer Bevington	Bay Center	<a href="mailto:Jenniferbevington@sbcglobal.net">Jenniferbevington@sbcglobal.net</a>
Richard Denton		<a href="mailto:Rdenton06@comcast.net">Rdenton06@comcast.net</a>
Robert G. Hale	BASMAA	<a href="mailto:Bobh@acpwa.org">Bobh@acpwa.org</a>
Jim Haussener	CMANC	<a href="mailto:Jim@cmanc.com">Jim@cmanc.com</a>
Ben Horenstein	EBMUD	<a href="mailto:Bhorenst@ebmud.com">Bhorenst@ebmud.com</a>
Roger James	SFBRWQCB (ret)	<a href="mailto:roger.james1@comcast.net">roger.james1@comcast.net</a>
Jane Lavelle	SFPUC	<a href="mailto:Jlavelle@sfgwater.org">Jlavelle@sfgwater.org</a>
Lindy Lowe	BCDC	<a href="mailto:Lindyl@bcdc.ca.gov">Lindyl@bcdc.ca.gov</a>
Karen McDonough	San Jose	<a href="mailto:Karen.McDonough@sanjoseca.gov">Karen.McDonough@sanjoseca.gov</a>
Steve Moore	Nute Engineering	<a href="mailto:Smooore@nute-engr.com">Smooore@nute-engr.com</a>
Kelly Moran	TDC Environmental	<a href="mailto:kmoran@tdcenvironmental.com">kmoran@tdcenvironmental.com</a>
Trish Mulvey	Clean South Bay, FOE	<a href="mailto:Mulvey@ix.netcom.com">Mulvey@ix.netcom.com</a>
Tom Mumley	SFBRWQCB	<a href="mailto:Tmumley@waterboards.ca.gov">Tmumley@waterboards.ca.gov</a>
Michele Pla	BA Clean Water Agencies	<a href="mailto:Mpla-cleanwater@comcast.net">Mpla-cleanwater@comcast.net</a>
Linda Rao	SFBRWQCB	<a href="mailto:LRao@waterboards.ca.gov">LRao@waterboards.ca.gov</a>
Kirsten Struve	San Jose	<a href="mailto:Kirsten.Struve@sanjoseca.gov">Kirsten.Struve@sanjoseca.gov</a>
Gayle Tupper	EBMUD	<a href="mailto:Gtupper@ebmud.com">Gtupper@ebmud.com</a>
David Williams	EBMUD	<a href="mailto:Dwilliam@ebmud.com">Dwilliam@ebmud.com</a>

Workgroup meetings have been held April 11, 2006; June 9, 2006; August 8, 2006; and Sept. 9, 2006. Meeting Summaries are posted below.

## **NOTES for Pollution Prevention and Reduction Workgroup, CCMP April 11, 2006**

We received comments both at the meeting and in follow-up emails. The comments received are either general in nature or relate to a specific goal, objective or action. I will first state the general comments received and identify who made the comment.

Please review the notes for accuracy and clarity. If you are one of the people who I cite here, please carefully review to make sure that I have captured your comments accurately. Feel free to elaborate and/or edit. Go ahead and use track changes mode or put in comments or whatever you feel is easiest.

I have tried to identify the relevant action items under each suggested change. Make sure you agree with how I have stated it because this will become our blueprint for the work we need to accomplish from here on out.

### **General Comments**

**Steve Moore** made the observation that, globally, there are at least three issues needed to be incorporated or expanded into re-worked goals, objectives, actions for CCMP:

1. Stream and wetland protection and restoration – pollutant reduction related to functions
2. Emerging toxic pollutants of concern, such as pesticides, flame retardants, pharmaceuticals, surfactants, and other consumer products
3. Pollution prevention and reduction in urban runoff

**Roger James** made some specific recommendations in addition to Steve's:

1. We need to establish a reliable long-term source of funding to identify emerging pollutants, determine the characteristics, transport and fate of these pollutants and impacts on beneficial uses of urban creeks, wetlands and the Bay; identify control strategies including pollutant source control and reduction; and, conduct long-term monitoring to assess the effectiveness of these measures.

2. The current level of funding (get from SFEI, but I believe is less than \$4 million which represents about 50 cents a person/year/Bay Area resident) needs to be increased tenfold over a period of two to three years. This increased funding should come from a modest increase of assessments of POTWs with a majority assessed to storm water programs. Storm water runoff is the likely the greatest source of many emerging pollutants, is the least monitored source of all pollutants and this source of funding would be one of the most equitable means of collecting additional funds from all people in the Bay Area. The impact of this on a residents current storm water assessment needs to be considered, but I currently pay \$35/year so I am talking about an increase in a typical household of 20-30%. I am sure there will be very strong opposition to this increase from the storm water programs, but they face this increase anyway if they are required by the

RWQCB to start monitoring the impacts of their discharges and they have already materially benefited from the storm water fees by replacing general funds for programs like street sweeping.

**Ben Horenstein** noted that the goals, objectives, and actions are currently not prioritized in any fashion. He notes that this could be a problem in view of resource limitations. There is some text on Pg. 191 of the CCMP that speaks to CCMP implementation . We think that this could be expanded just a bit to describe how other entities (e.g. agencies) are involved in guiding priority setting process.

**Action item** needed here is for the project management team to decide if more is needed in this section regarding priorities or description of how the CCMP gets implemented.

### **Nomination for New Goal**

Steve nominated a new (5<sup>th</sup>) goal for pollution prevention and reduction:

"Enhance pollutant assimilative capacity by restoring natural stream and wetland functions throughout the estuary and its watershed."

At the meeting, we agreed that:

- Wetland and stream functions can enhance pollutant removal
- Other existing actions will link to this goal, but we may need new actions
- We are not talking about engineered wetlands here
- We want to create incentives to enhance stream/wetland systems
- Where should this goal go? Wetlands? Landuse? Multiple? (need feedback on this)
- We need to reinforce the idea that function enhancement for pollutant assimilation should not compromise beneficial uses (BUs)

**Action item** needed here is that the project management team needs to decide where this goal belongs and give us direction about what verbage should appear in our section of the CCMP.

### **Recommendations for changes/additions to actions**

**Kelly Moran** recommended an additional action to support Objective PO-1.

“Seek Redesign, reformulation, or replacement of commercial products that are sources of water pollution”

Suggested performance measure: Case studies of past and ongoing experiences

**Steve Moore** suggested the following edits to actions to support Objective PO-1.

**PO-1.2 Effluent tax idea:** convert negative incentive to positive incentive by using term like “pollutant reduction credit”

The thought here is that we want to create incentives and not just penalties. This could either be put in as an edit to PO-1.2 or a new action. If this is stated as new action, then we will need to come up with performance measures for it.

We need to be careful of environmental justice concerns surrounding pollutant trading concept. Therefore, we should run this edit by environmental NGOs. In that vein, we need to pay attention to monitoring needs.

**Action item** needed here is the wording and the buy-in from environmental NGOs.

**PO-1.6: Change to “implement”** comprehensive strategy to reduce pesticides (e.g., Urban Creek Pesticide TMDL)

**Roger James** recommended the following changes to **PO-1.4**

- ❑ Reword the title of the action to “Support regulatory efforts to improve agricultural practices..”
- ❑ Add in a few sentences to acknowledge the various efforts (monitoring, regulatory alternatives like Ag waivers) undertaken by the Central Valley Regional Board do address water quality impacts due to agriculture.
- ❑ This discussion could include a brief description of the Ag. Waiver program itself.

**Action item** needed here is the specific wording.

**Kelly Moran** (I think) recommended a **new action** under PO-1 to address pollution prevention of non-toxic urban sources (e.g. septic leaks, trash, etc.)

She also recommended a parallel change to action PO-2.4 that addressed **control** of non-toxic sources in urban runoff (e.g. pump stations, trash, Bay margin DO issues, etc.)

**Action item** needed here would be a write up of the wording AND performance measures (only for new action under PO-1).

**Steve Moore** suggested the following edits to actions to support Objective PO-2.

Expand actions appropriately to recognize the need for positive incentives for POTWs to accept urban runoff for treatment/pollution reduction. Encourage dry weather urban runoff diversions and first flush treatment where feasible, by granting pollution reduction credits to municipalities and sanitary districts that implement these projects, which are not trivial logistically or financially.

**Action item** needed here is for Steve (or the group) to identify the specifics of where these changes need to be made, and then we need to make them.

PO 2-4: URBAN RUNOFF needs to be expanded significantly, based on evolution of the program in the Bay Area and statewide.

Actions should be developed related to:

1. Trash pollution prevention and reduction
2. Urban runoff pump station design, operation and maintenance
  - a. Discharges from these common installations are a controllable water quality factor (see Basin Plan definition) that has been unregulated.  
Opportunity for positive incentives to reduce 303d pollutants and trash.
3. Dry weather and first flush diversions to sanitary sewers
4. Stream and wetland function enhancement (protection/restoration)
5. Bay beach protection (water contact recreation)
6. Post-construction stormwater management (Link to existing Action LU-3.2 for consistency)
  - a. Expand to include actions related to site design in new and re-development
  - b. Develop regional approach to retrofitting existing development
    - i. Site design
    - ii. Installation of vortex separators and equivalent technology to reduce discharges of trash and particulate-bound pollutants
    - iii. Installation of drainage features that remove dissolved pollutants
7. Forum to address regulatory and institutional barriers
  - a. Public safety concerns
    - i. Mosquito abatement
    - ii. Fire response access
    - iii. Crime and homelessness
  - b. Municipal codes for parking, other impervious surfaces

**Action item** needed here is specific wording.

PO-2.5: Energy and transportation – update to be consistent with current permits and BMPs from Caltrans and other transportation agencies

**Action item** needed here is specific wording.

PO-3.2: Toxic hotspot cleanup

- Expand with lessons learned from Zeneca/Stege Marsh toxic hotspot cleanup (Public involvement and outreach at toxic cleanup sites)
- Legal authority to compel cleanup at sites with no readily identifiable responsible parties, (e.g., Islais Creek, Mission Creek, and Oakland Inner Harbor sites) or recalcitrant RPs (San Leandro Bay).

- Federal facilities

**Action item** needed here is specific wording.

**Roger James** suggested that under PO-2.4 that generally states **what the law says now** regarding urban runoff. Specifically, he recommends that should include some statement of the SWRCB's general permit requirement (performance-based) of development and implementation of a storm water management program that describes BMPs, measurable goals and timetables for implementation in each of the six program areas (minimum control measures). Further, he suggested that we explain that Water Boards also have the authority to require additional controls (beyond those falling under MEP) necessary to achieve compliance with WQS.

It was also suggested that there is a linkage to LU-3.2 such that similar language could appear there or there could be a linkage/reference.

Someone also made a comment to somehow focus on what Muni programs face in taking the next steps beyond MEP. [I am not sure if I captured this comment accurately].

**Action item** needed here is specific wording. This will be a challenge to write up in a succinct fashion, but it can be done. I think we need a paragraph and not much more.

**NOTES for Pollution Prevention and Reduction Workgroup, CCMP  
June 9, 2006**

**Attendees:** Richard Looker, Robert Hale (Alameda Co., Kelly Moran, TDC Env (by phone), Roger James, RWQCB ret., Lindy Lowe, BCDC, Gayle Tupper, EBMUD, Steve Moore, Nute Eng, Joan Patton, Marcia Brockbank, Paula Trigueros (SFEP)

**Facilitator's meeting from June 30:** I sent out the meeting notes from the facilitator's meeting, but I wanted to emphasize some points from that meeting that are relevant to our work:

- ❑ Workgroups should look at program area preamble (very beginning of chapter) and craft an addendum to it.
- ❑ We should reflect on past successes and challenges as we edit the preamble material.
- ❑ We need to do a demonstration of a performance measure for one of our new actions (this can be as brief as a paragraph).
- ❑ By November, we need to prepare a 1-2 pager to summarize the changes to our section and identify so-called "hot" topics that the implementation committee should be aware of.

During our next meeting, we should aim to get closure on the stated issues and determine writing assignments and schedule for completing those assignments.

**Notes from the 6-9-06 meeting**

**General Notes:**

The group discussed the Delta Smelt issue that was raised through email and considered it too species specific for inclusion in the pollution-prevention section of the CCMP. I have forwarded the issue raised in Richard Denton's email to Marcia Brockbank for her to route to the appropriate workgroup. The rest of the discussion fell into the following 6 topic areas:

**1) Discussion regarding wetland and stream function of enhancing pollutant removal.**

The group continued a discussion on this topic. Roger expressed the following concerns/observations:

- ❑ Only a few pollutants (nutrients, metals, pH, oxygen) could be affected in this way
- ❑ Beneficial uses (BUs) must be protected so these strategies should be used carefully
- ❑ He cited a study by Rich Horner where wetlands were degraded (presumably a treatment wetland?)

- ❑ It is important not to convey the message that you can just dump urban runoff in a wetland
- ❑ We need to carefully craft the message in the CCMP on this issue

## **2) How to fund large-scale improvements in pollution prevention/infrastructure.**

The group thought it was important to convey ways to generate financial resources to pay for upgrades to infrastructure and pollution prevention programs. The group thought it was important for the CCMP to call out the need for the improvements and hint at possible funding solutions like:

- ❑ Passing bond measures (this was done in Southern California)
- ❑ Bigger property assessments (presumably urban runoff)
- ❑ POTW fees

## **3) Funding tied to improved communication**

We agreed that it is critical to educate local officials and their constituents about the needs for spending in this arena to promote quality of life in the Bay Area. This communication should focus on the needs and possible solutions. Does SFEP have a role in this? How can we state this in the CCMP? It was also noted that the SOCAL bond measure was tightly tied to the public outcry regarding beach closures and the impacts on the local economy from lost tourism dollars. We need some way to generate enough public support to convince local leaders.

The group made the observation that people do care about the Bay but perhaps in a theoretical, detached way that does not spur them to action. They do not seem to recognize the Bay as a vital resource to the local economy in the same that Southern California views its beaches.

Despite lots of monitoring and communication efforts, Bay residents still do not seem to be getting information about what is happening. There is difficulty getting information from public funded studies to do claims of “proprietary information”.

The group identified three main communication issues that should be addressed: 1) communication to policy-makers, 2) communication to environmental technical professionals, and 3) communication to the general public.

## **4) Regarding action PO 3.1 (clean up contaminants affecting fish, wildlife, their habitats, and food supplies)**

Add reference to emerging chemicals. The reference to TBT should be removed. There should be a reference to seeking funding for clean-ups (grants, State’s clean up and abatement account, etc.). We also need to identify longer-term funding sources for larger issues like TMDLs and the like.

**5) Regarding action PO 3.2 (expedite the clean up of toxic hotspots in estuarine sediments)**

It was noted that the Stege Marsh experience teaches us the importance of involving the local community in the clean-up process. It was also recommended that we call out contaminated areas where the Bay receives runoff draining industrial areas as a particular problem.

A suggestion was made that we call for the creation of some sort of entity (could be a funding mechanism or authority) to accomplish clean-ups under the direction of the Water Board or DTSC. Then, the cost recovery could be accomplished after the fact. It was recognized that we (Water Board) do not have direct means of remediating sites using available funds. We need a contracting authority to take action in site cleanups.

**6) Regarding action PO-1 or PO-2 (categorizing pollutants by origin, level of certainty, and implementation approach)**

We finally had a discussion about how monitoring has matured in the past 10 years. This may be a sentiment to be expressed in the new version of the preamble or introduction to our section. The RMP has evolved and matured and is now a “fairly comprehensive” program for monitoring biota, sediment, and water, and special studies that include identification of contamination sources. Through all of this we have learned a lot about identifying pollutant sources, but we need to learn more about how to implement P2 or to do remediation. This led to the recommendation that we organize the pollutants according to 3 categories:

- i) pollutants for which the sources have been sufficiently well identified to do effective P2 right now.
- ii) Pollutants for which sources have been identified but there is not sufficient information to do effective P2
- iii) Pollutants for which we do not have good information about sources – emerging contaminants.

Accordingly, the CCMP should have a narrative explanation of this organization and a table that sorts the various pollutants of interest into a particular category. Then, the stated goal should be to move those pollutants in higher categories 2 or 3 eventually into category 1. It was noted that the task of identifying sources is somewhat different (easier) for POTWs than it is for UR because of the better mechanism of control on the POTW side.

Here are the tentative category assignments for the table (need to fill this in):

**Category 1:** copper, silver, OP pesticides, TBT, some Hg (e.g. dental amalgam), some PCBs

**Category 2:** Hg in UR, some PCBs, others?

**Category 3:** emerging contaminants like PBDEs, PFOAs, PFOs, endocrine disruptors, PAHs, phthalates, anti-microbial soap residues.

CCMP UPDATE - POLLUTION PREVENTION WORKGROUP  
Tuesday, August 8, 2006, 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM  
Room 1411, State Building, 1515 Clay Street, Oakland

MEETING SUMMARY

**Present:** Bob Hale, Roger James, Richard Looker, Steve Moore, Joan Patton and Kelly Moran by phone

**Introductions:** Richard Looker, Chair, opened the meeting and Workgroup members introduced themselves. Richard reviewed the Agenda.

**Approval of Meeting Notes from June 9, 2006 Meeting:** The notes were approved with the notation that "wetlands" refers to natural and not constructed wetlands. Roger James brought a copy of the *Wetlands and Urbanization Report*, which provides guidelines for constructed and natural wetlands protection. According to findings in the report, stormwater does impact wetlands. Treatment and BMPs are needed.

**CCMP Facilitators Meeting:** Richard reported briefly about the meeting. The facilitators discussed Performance Measures and how to establish them; preparation of a "strawman" version of a new Action for each Workgroup; what should be included in the "What" and "Who" for each Action. The "What" should be a clear statement of the problem addressed, the action to be taken, and the expected outcome. The "Who" should include the various entities that will undertake the action. Richard will send out some examples of activities and effectiveness that can be used by the Workgroup.

**Proposed Work Assignment Sheet:** Richard and the Workgroup then began review and discussion about proposed revisions and tasks based on the Assignment Sheet.

- 1) Anticipated changes and notable controversial Actions: Richard will prepare write-up for the Implementation Committee.
- 2) "Strawman" version of new action with performance measure: Richard will prepare "strawman" if needed.
- 3) Pollution Prevention Introduction: Richard will prepare an update, including successes and challenges, for the Introduction to the revised Pollution Prevention document. Need to add "emerging pollutants".
- 4) New goal: Steve Moore and Roger James will write a new goal related to increased pollutant assimilative capacity as a result of stream and wetlands restoration. May need new Action to carry out this goal or could put information in the Introduction. Could be a controversial item.
- 5) Addition to PO-1. New Action regarding commercial products, emerging contaminants. Kelly Moran will flesh out the "What" plus develop Performance Measure.
- 6) PO-1.2: Need to restate positively.
- 7) Additional Action for PO-1: Kelly Moran will develop Action to address pollution prevention of non-toxic urban sources.

- 8) Edit of PO-2.4: Kelly does not want to work on this Action related to control of non-toxic urban sources. The Action should be consistent with State Board decisions and upcoming changes to the NPDES program. Bob Hale will take the lead with assistance from Richard.
- 9) Edits to PO-1.4: Roger and Richard will work on PO-1.4
- 10) PO-1.6. Make minor changes. Kelly to check for outdated information; Richard to work on TMDLs and pull in Tom Mumley. Bob Hale to take the lead.
- 11) PO-2 - source control. First flush - what does this mean? Take out. Need to address dry weather flows and those wet weather flows that are of significance. Steve Moore will take the lead.
- 12) PO-2.4. Roger to send info to Bob Hale who then takes the lead.
- 13) Edits to PO-2.5: Need to find a person to develop.
- 14) PO-3.2: Richard will write. Needs to include sensitivity to and participation by local community
- 15) Edit PO-3.2. Need to act adaptively and practically and not just wait until you have all the data. Need creation of a new process to do clean-ups. The subject could go in the Introduction "Challenges" section.
- 16) Funding for large-scale improvements in pollution prevention and infrastructure: Example of Southern California and beach closures, which galvanized public support for bond issue.
- 17) Need volunteer to write.
- 18) Edit PO-3.1: Emerging chemicals. Remove TBT from existing Action. Richard will rewrite.
- 19) PO-1 and/or PO-2. Prevention, control and remediation of pollutants. Gayle Tupper will be asked to write. Need to craft some type of table or matrix.

**Next Meeting:** Mid to late September. Workgroup members should send Richard a progress report at this time.

CCMP UPDATE - POLLUTION PREVENTION WORKGROUP  
Friday, September 29, 2007, 10:00 AM - 12:00 PM  
Room 1411, State Building, 1515 Clay Street, Oakland

MEETING SUMMARY

**NOTE: New email address for Richard Denton:** [rdenton06@comcast.net](mailto:rdenton06@comcast.net)  
**Email address for Gayle Tupper, EBMUD:** [Gtupper@ebmud.com](mailto:Gtupper@ebmud.com)

**Present:** Roger James, Richard Looker, Joan Patton, Paula Trigueros, Gayle Tupper, and Kelly Moran by phone

**Introductions and Agenda:** Richard Looker, Chair, opened the meeting and Workgroup members introduced themselves. Richard went over the Agenda items and various handout materials.

**Review of Workgroup Progress:** Members reviewed the Proposed Work Assignment Sheet developed by Richard. The sheet contains a list of Goals, Objectives and Actions, which have been proposed for revision, and the name of the Workgroup member assigned to each task. To date, there is only one new Action item, which Kelly Moran is developing. The Workgroup also noted those items with changes that might be controversial. There was discussion about each assigned task, and confirmation about status. Changes or comments on tasks are noted below. Strike-through indicates no numbered item. (See accompanying Assignment Sheet for details)

- 0) No changes
- 1) Due date: 10/15/06
- 2) ~~No changes~~
- 3) No changes
- 4) No changes
- 5) Due date: 10/30/06
- 6) No changes
- 7) Due date: 10/30/06
- 8) Richard will check with Bob Hale to determine status
- 9) Roger will draft language. Due date: 10/15/06 --- Potential controversial Action
- 10) Due date: 10/30/06
- 11) No changes
- 12) ~~No changes~~
- 13) Assigned to Richard and Roger ---- Discussion about particulate size, trash, definition of pollutant characteristics, global warming legislation impacts
- 14) Roger has started. Needs to be completed by Bob Hale.
- 15) No changes
- 16) Richard will complete and include sources, too. ----- Potential controversial Action
- 17) Richard will write. ----- Potential controversial Action
- 18) Needs to be assigned to someone or dropped.
- 19) No changes
- 20) Gayle Tupper will write. Due date: 10/30/06

Once the Workgroup has completed its revisions, Richard will write a new Introduction, which will include Successes since 1993 and current Challenges. Richard will give a brief status report to the Implementation Committee at their meeting on November 3, 2006 and will send out a copy to Workgroup members to review prior to the meeting.

The Workgroup then reviewed the CCMP Pollution Prevention document, which contains recommended revisions to the original, 1993 document. The Workgroup agreed, with minor word changes, to accept Steve Moore's new Goal: "Promote restoration and enhancement of stream and wetland functions to mitigate the effects of pollutants in the Estuary and its watersheds."

**Next Meeting:** Early to mid-November. Richard will propose dates.

Pollution Prevention Workgroup  
Sept. 29, 2006

Attachment: Proposed Work Assignments for P2 CCMP update (Status as of September 28, 2006)

Task	Assigned to: (proposed)	Draft Due Date:	Status:
0) Need example of a new action + perf metrics	Richard Looker	9/15	Kelly will be writing the only new actions so work with her on getting example of performance metrics as she submits draft
1) Prepare a brief (1-2 page) write-up for the implementation committee on the anticipated changes and any notable hot topics.	Richard Looker w/ help from group	11/3/06	** Not yet started ** will prepare in mid-October to reflect progress to date at that time. Would like to have drafts in hand of all modifications that we will touch as a group.
3) Prepare brief update to material on pg. 133-136 of the CCMP, and add new sections on successes and challenges. This should reflect on progress (or lack) on the issues stated in the current version of CCMP.	Richard Looker w/ help from group	9/15	To be accomplished after updates complete or at least in draft form. Need input from group on challenges/successes in last 10 years, including feedback on any modifications of approach to this problem as well.
4) Establish new Goal: ""Enhance pollutant assimilative capacity by restoring natural stream and wetland functions throughout the estuary and its watershed." Should write material for Problem Statement or Recommended approach and make sure there are actions tied to this goal (see notes from 4-11-06 and 6-9-06 meetings for guidance).	Steve Moore and Roger James	9/15	Steve submitted draft on 9-18-06
5) Additional Action for PO-1 "Seek Redesign, reformulation, or replacement of commercial products that are sources of water pollution" (needs performance metrics, see notes from 4-11-06 meeting). This is where Emerging Contaminants should come into play.	Kelly Moran (+ assistance from Richard)	9/15	Kelly will accomplish in October
6) Edits to PO-1.2 to turn "effluent taxes" into incentives like "pollutant reduction credit" (see notes from 4-11-06 meeting).	Steve Moore	9/15	Steve submitted draft on 9-18-06
7) Additional Action for PO-1 to address pollution prevention of non-toxic urban sources (e.g. septic leaks, trash, etc., needs performance metrics, see notes from 4-11-06 meeting).	Kelly Moran	9/15	Kelly will accomplish in October
8) Parallel edit to the above for existing action PO-2.4 that addresses control of non-toxic urban sources (e.g. pump stations, trash, Bay margin DO issues., see notes from 4-11-06 meeting).	Bob Hale takes lead and Richard assists	9/15	Goal is to make this consistent with current regulatory program, what is going on with updating MRP, including TMDLs.

Pollution Prevention Workgroup  
 Sept. 29, 2006

			**** not yet started ***
9) Edits to PO-1.4: Reword the title of the action to “Support regulatory efforts to improve agricultural practices..” Add in a few sentences to acknowledge the various efforts (monitoring, regulatory alternatives like Ag waivers) undertaken by the Central Valley Regional Board to address water quality impacts due to agriculture. This discussion could include a brief description of the Ag. Waiver program itself. (see notes from 4-11-06 meeting).	Roger James and Richard Looker	9/15	*** not yet started ***
10) Updates to PO-1.6 change “develop” to “implement” and make any necessary cleanups in the “what” section (see notes from 4-11-06 meeting).	Kelly Moran for general issues, Richard for adding in TMDLs and new programs with help from Mumley	9/15	Kelly will accomplish in October
11) Need edits to existing actions or new actions to support PO-2 to expand actions appropriately to recognize the need for positive incentives for POTWs to accept urban runoff for treatment/pollution reduction. Encourage dry weather urban runoff diversions and strategic treatment where feasible (may need performance metrics if new actions suggested, see 4-11-06 notes).	Steve Moore	9/15	Richard and Steve submitted draft on 9-18
13) Edit PO-2.5: Energy and transportation – update to be consistent with current permits and BMPs from Caltrans and other transportation agencies. (what does this mean?)	Need volunteer	9/15	If we do not get a volunteer or get clarification of the need for this, consider dropping it. *** not yet started ***
14) Edit PO-2.4 summarize what the law says now regarding urban runoff. Include some statement of the SWRCB’s general permit requirement (performance-based) of development and implementation of a storm water management program that describes BMPs, measurable goals and timetables for implementation in each of the six program areas (minimum control measures). Explain that Water Boards also have the authority to require additional controls (beyond those falling under MEP) necessary to achieve compliance with WQS. (see 4-11-06 notes).	Roger James sends info to Bob Hale who takes lead. This is to be done in conjunction with #8	9/15	*** not yet started ***
15) PO-3.2: Toxic hotspot cleanup. Expand with lessons learned from Zeneca/Stege Marsh toxic hotspot cleanup (Public involvement and outreach at toxic cleanup sites). (see 4-11-06 notes).	Richard	9/15	Richard completed draft (9-22)
16) Edit PO-3.2: Toxic hotspot cleanup. It was also recommended that we call out contaminated areas where the Bay receives runoff draining industrial areas as a particular problem. Call for the creation of some sort of entity (could be a funding mechanism or authority) to accomplish clean-ups under the direction of the Water Board or DTSC (see 6-9-06 notes).	Richard	9/15	Richard completed draft 9-25-06  Part of this will involve edits to front material on challenges with current process for ID-ing and

Pollution Prevention Workgroup  
 Sept. 29, 2006

			conducting cleanups, who oversees, public involvement, etc.. New actions may be necessary too or edits to 3.2.
17) How do we fund large-scale improvements in pollution prevention and infrastructure? Where does this go? Is this a new objective or an action under an existing objective or what? If adding action, need performance measure (see 6-9-06 notes).	Need volunteer	9/15	Linked to #18 as well. If no volunteer, consider dropping this as update.  ** not yet started **
18) Improve communication of Bay issues. Three main communication issues that should be addressed: 1) communication to policy-makers, 2) communication to environmental technical professionals, and 3) communication to the general public. Where does this go? If adding new action, need performance measures (see 6-9-06 notes).	Need volunteer	9/15	Action should be to develop this communication strategy to change attitudes in citizens and decision-makers. Need to mobilize public support for #17. If not volunteer to take it on, consider dropping it.  ** not yet started **
19) Edit action PO-3.1, Add reference to emerging chemicals. The reference to TBT should be removed. There should be a reference to seeking funding for clean-ups (grants, State's clean up and abatement account, etc.). We also need to identify longer-term funding sources for larger issues like TMDLs and the like (see 6-9-06 notes).	Richard Looker	9/15	Richard completed draft (9-22)
20) Edits to PO-1 or PO-2 or both. We need to categorize pollutants by origin, level of certainty, and implementation approach and propose appropriate actions and performance metrics (see notes for 6-9-06 meeting). May need to craft a table of pollutants according to this organization scheme.	Gayle Tupper	9/15	** not yet started **  No confirmation from Gayle or BACWA rep that they can assist with drafting this